

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 26-58 are pending.

I. 35 USC § 112

A. Claims 1 and 26-56

Claims 1 and 26-56 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim that which is considered the invention. The Office Action asserts claim 1 is “generally narrative and indefinite.” In response, claim 1 has been amended to properly conform with U.S. patent practice.

The Office Action additionally identifies various issues in claims 33, 34, 47, 48, and 51-55. By this amendment, Applicants have amended the claims to correct any lack of antecedent basis and/or clarify the language used in the claims. In so doing, Applicants have removed features previously presented by claims 33 and 34. New claims 57 and 58 are directed to such features. No new matter has been entered.

II. Hansson et al.

Apparently, claims 1, 26-40, 45-50, 55 and 56 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Hansson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,565,919), while claims 41-44 and 51-54 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hansson et al. in view of Andersen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,720,913).

Applicants respectfully present that Hansson et al. is not a proper reference under 35 USC § 102 (nor can it be therefore can be used in a rejection based upon 35 USC § 103). Specifically, Hansson et al. has a § 102(e) date of November 24, 2000. However, the present application claims priority from Swedish patent application no. 0003550-1, having been filed October 3, 2000. (A verified copy of the priority application, along with a Claim for Priority is being concurrently filed, and acknowledgment is respectfully requested.) As can be seen from the priority document, the claims are fully supported by the Swedish application. Therefore, Hansson et al. cannot be cited against this application.

Additionally, with respect to the §103 rejection, it is respectfully presented that the present application and Hansson et al. were, at the time the invention of the subject matter of the present application was made, owned or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same entity. Accordingly, Hansson et al. is not a proper reference for use in an obviousness rejection where it would qualify as prior art under 35 USC § 102(e). See 35 USC § 103(c).

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all objections and rejections are overcome. Thus, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

TPP/EPR
Attorney Docket No.: TPP 31424

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas P. Pavelko
Registration No. 31,689

STEVENS, DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.
1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 850
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 785-0100
Facsimile: (202) 408-5200 or (202) 408-5088

Date: May 13, 2004